

45

FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES S. ROLLINS, OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 12, 1864,

ON

THE RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. COLFAX, PROPOSING TO EXPEL MR. LONG.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel somewhat embarrassed, because I shall not be able to make, in the three minutes assigned to me, a very interesting speech; and unless I can entrench upon the time of my friend from New Jersey, [Mr. ROGERS,] who I believe is next to occupy the floor, I shall claim from the courtesy of the Speaker the opportunity of submitting on Thursday morning a few remarks.

I think, Mr. Speaker, from the demonstrations we have had here to-night, that the heart of every patriot in this House and in these galleries ought to be filled with hope and assured with confidence that the country is safe! Certainly no man after the broad, liberal, patriotic, and *anti-partisan views* which we have heard expressed here, can have a shadow of doubt that we shall be able to suppress this rebellion!

To abandon irony, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that my heart is filled with sadness at the continued notes of party! party!! party!!! which I hear sounded. It seems to me, all are for party and none for the country, that on both sides of the House it is a continual attempt to obtain some small advantage for party, not to promote the great interests of the Union, but those of party for the next presidential election.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MR. ELDRIDGE. I hope the gentleman shall have leave to go on.
There was no objection.

MR. ROLLINS, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I could save this country from destruction, I would be willing that this or that side of the House should select the man to preside over its destinies, not only for the next four but for the next forty years. If I could save the Government from destruction, it would be a small matter to me whether Abraham Lincoln or George B. McClellan presided over the country's destinies.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my opinion regarding the resolution proposed by the honorable Speaker of this House. I shall not vote for the expulsion of the member from Ohio. I think that resolution the most ill-timed that has been proposed here during the present session. If the speech of the gentleman from Ohio contains poison, which is likely to produce disease in the body-politic of the country, the honorable Speaker could not have selected a more efficient mode of infusing that poison into the public heart of the country than by introducing a resolution to expel the honorable member from Ohio.

Without that resolution, I venture to say that the speech of the gentleman from Ohio would not have been read by perhaps a thousand persons in the United States; but as it is, it will be read in every State, in every village, in every mansion and cabin from one corner of the land to the other. If it had not been for the resolution the honorable Speaker has offered, the speech of the gentleman from Ohio would have fallen still-born from his lips. It would have

passed, like the speeches of other gentlemen, delivered here, into the political historical rubbish of the country, and most of us would have forgotten, within a few weeks or months, that it had ever been delivered.

I repeat, sir, if that speech contains political poison, the censure for disseminating it must fall upon the head of the honorable Speaker of this House. If it be a dagger aimed at the national heart, it is the strong hand of the Speaker that directs it, and drives home the fatal blow! And, sir, if this speech is capable of doing the injury which seems to be attributed to it, to the Speaker, far more than to the gentleman from Ohio will that injury be due.

But, sir, I do not apprehend any serious detriment from that speech. If the cause of the Union and the cause of the country is to be shaken by such a *speech as that*, it ought to perish; and if one hundred and eighty-three members of the House are not competent, morally and intellectually, to meet the honorable gentleman from Ohio, in his argument, and show that he is wrong; if they cannot furnish the antidote for the poison, then I say we are unworthy to represent a free people in a great crisis like this. We are doing but poor justice to their intelligence and patriotism if we suppose, for a moment, that a speech *like that* could shake their confidence in the stability of the Government and in the permanency of our free institutions.

For myself, sir, I have no fears of the effect of that speech. I rely upon the discriminating intelligence of the great masses of the American people to correct, in their own minds, the gross errors with which it abounds; and for its utterance I would not expel or even censure the gentleman. I would not do it because I am in favor of the largest liberty of debate, especially in times like these. In my judgment the wisdom of our ancestors has been no better illustrated than in that provision of the Constitution which says that no member shall be expelled except upon the vote of two-thirds of the members of this body. We see the importance of the rule on this occasion. We see the lengths to which party spirit would run. We see daily, in the affairs that occur upon this floor, that questions of the utmost importance are not decided upon their merits; but invariably according to the strength of the party on this or that side of the House. And while I do not mean to cast a slur upon any member in connection with this question, yet it may be safely said that, in consequence of the hold which party has taken upon the minds of members here, it would be just as easy to expel a man upon *any other* question that might be presented. It is a question of party, and I do not pretend to say that under like circumstances the same thing would not be attempted, for party purposes, by this side of the House. It is one of the evils of party spirit under a Government like this. It is one of those baneful, poisonous influences which we ought to resist, especially when, as at the present time, the country is struggling for its existence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am for the largest latitude of discussion upon all questions, and while I disavow the sentiments uttered by the gentleman from Ohio, in the speech for which we are called upon to expel or censure him, while I say to him and to the House that I think it was a most ill-timed, injudicious, and, I might add, considering the circumstances in which it was delivered, unpatriotic speech—while I say all this, yet, tolerating as I do the largest liberty of debate, the utmost freedom of discussion, I would not even publicly censure him for it. I do not believe that that speech will be as productive of as much harm as many gentlemen suppose. It merely expresses the opinion the gentleman entertains, from his view of the circumstances which now surround us, and much as I condemn both the sentiments, and the Speaker for uttering them, I would not expel or censure him for his great indiscretion. Sir, if every member who makes indiscreet, unwise, and, I might add, foolish speeches on this floor, was expelled or censured, how long would there be left a quorum, and how little of legislation would command our attention here, except in discussing resolutions of censure? He has merely followed the opinion and example of his great leader, Vallandigham, who delivered substantially the same speech in the last Congress, that members around me heard, and yet no movement was made to expel him for much stronger language than that used on Friday last by the gentleman from Ohio. It was a remark of Thomas Jefferson's, that great apostle of American liberty, "that error ceases to be dangerous so long

as reason is left free to combat it." And the first amendment made to the Federal Constitution after its adoption is as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or *abridging the freedom of speech or of the press*; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

If, sir, we cannot pass a law, abridging the freedom of the press or of speech, without violating the Constitution, how cautious should we be in adopting another mode of punishment, unknown to the Constitution and utterly violative of its true spirit! In despotic Governments the first blow struck at the liberty of the citizen is always that of muzzling the press and abridging the sacred right of free discussion—a right inestimable to freemen and formidable to tyrants only. Sir, it is the very essence of liberty, to form our opinions and to express them according to the dictates of our own consciences. And to this sacred privilege, gradually left unrestrained, as the world emerged from the dark period of the middle ages, to the dawn of light of the last few centuries, we are indebted for the wonderful advancement which we now behold in religion, in science, government, and in civilization. Argue as you may, sir, a despotic Government would nowhere be found on the face of the earth, amidst a virtuous, enlightened, and educated people, with a free press and free speech! And a great and free people will not be in danger of losing their liberties as long as these sacred rights are properly guarded and vindicated.

It is well known that, for many years past, one great complaint of the northern people has been, that they were not, without violence, allowed to print and speak their sentiments south of a certain line, on a particular subject. And shall we now, sir, after all that has been said on this subject, retrograde, and here in the very Hall of our national Legislature strike down the right of free discussion by expelling a member from his seat for words spoken in debate? Sir, I, for one, am prepared for no such work as this. Let us answer and expose the pernicious views of the honorable member, as I take it we are fully competent to do, and then let us turn him over to the tender mercies of his constituency, whose indignation will be in direct ratio with their patriotism, to dispose of his case as to them may seem most proper and right. But let us not desecrate this temple, dedicated to the cause of liberty and free discussion, by assailing one of its chief bulwarks in striking down the right of free speech. It is possible that erroneous and dangerous doctrines may be taught here, and I can well suppose a case where the cause of the Government might be temporarily damaged; but this would be of short duration under the searching operation of free discussion in this representative Chamber.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amidst its worshippers."

And, sir, in my view, the cause of this Government and of the American Union is the cause of truth, and however much it may be assailed, by the puny and traitorous arms of those who would tear it down, or by the still weaker words of those men of faint hearts and vacillating hopes who in the midst of this mighty and unparalleled struggle for national existence would give up all as lost; while I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, speaking but from my own earnest faith, I predict that, sooner or later, the national authority will be vindicated, the enemies of the Government driven back in shame and disgrace, those who have spoken or dreamed of recognition will take back their injudicious words, and be made happy in once more kneeling with all the children of the Republic around the altar of a still unbroken and blessed Union, beneath the starry folds of that banner, from whose bright azure not one star will be severed!

I wish I had time, on this occasion, to go into a history of the discussion of public questions not only here but in the British Parliament, where the utmost freedom of debate has been allowed, tolerated, and encouraged.

During the war of the Revolution, when the infant colonies of this country were struggling for existence, every member upon this floor knows what terri-

ble anathemas were hurled against the British Government by Chatham, Burke, Fox, Sheridan, and other distinguished orators in the British Parliament. Their language has never been equalled in severity by anything that has ever been said by any member on this floor, and yet who ever heard of a resolution introduced for their expulsion!

To show how far these men went, I will quote one or two short extracts:

"The gentleman tells us America is obstinate. America is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted. Three million people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest."—*Lord Chatham, in 1776.*

In November, 1777, eighteen months subsequent to the Declaration of Independence, after two years of war, he said:

"As to conquest, my lords, I repeat, it is impossible. You may swell every expense and every effort still more extravagantly—pile and accumulate every assistance which you can beg or borrow, traffic and barter with every little pitiful German prince that sells and sends his subjects to the shambles of a foreign prince—your efforts are forever vain and impotent. If I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I would never lay down my arms; never, never, never."

"But in such a war as this, unjust in its principle, impracticable in its means, and ruinous in its consequences, I would not contribute a single effort nor a single shilling."

"The noble lord said the war was not disgraceful; it was only unfortunate. For my part I must continue to call it disgraceful, not unfortunate. I consider them all alike, victories and defeats; towns taken and towns evacuated; new generals appointed and old generals recalled; they are all alike calamities; they all spur us on to this fatal business. Victories give us hopes; defeats make us desperate; and both instigate us to go on." * * "Give us back our force, nor protract this burdensome, disgraceful, for it is not an unfortunate war."—*Edmund Burke, in 1781.*

Said Fox:

"There is not an American but *must* reject and *resist* the principle and the right."

I quote, from Mahon's History of England, volume seven, page 135, the language of the younger Pitt in favor of Fox's motion for a committee on the American war in the year 1781. I now read what he said:

"For my part, I am persuaded and will affirm, that it is a most accursed, wicked, barbarous, cruel, unnatural, unjust, and diabolical war. It was conceived in injustice; it was nurtured and brought forth in folly; its footsteps were marked with blood, slaughter, persecution, devastation."

In 1794, when the acquittal of Horne Tooke diffused such triumph all over England and gave a never to be forgotten lesson to Power through that great political safeguard—that life-preserver in stormy times—the trial by jury, Mr. Sheridan, in answer to Lord Mornington upon the address, said, in reference to the atrocities committed in France:

"* * * The surrounding States had goaded them into a still more savage state of madness, fury, and desperation. We had unsettled their reason, and then reviled their insanity; we drove them to the extremities that produced the evils we arraigned; we baited them like wild beasts until, at length, we made them so. * * *

"Such has been your conduct towards France, that you had created the passions which you persecute; you mark a nation to be cut off from the world; you covenant for their extermination; you swear to hunt them in their inmost recesses; you load them with every species of execration; and you now come forth with whining declarations on the horror of their turning upon you with the fury which you inspired. * * * Good God! sir—will those who stood forth with a parade of disinterested patriotism, and vaunted the sacrifices they had made, and the exposed situation they had chosen, in order the better to oppose the friends of Brissot in England—will they thank the noble Lord for reminding us how soon these lofty professions dwindled into little jobbing pursuits for followers and dependents, as unfit to fill the offices procured for them, as the offices themselves were unfit to be created? Will the train of newly titled alarmists, of super-numerary negotiations, of pensioned paymasters, agents, and commissaries, thank him for remarking to us how profitable their panic has been to themselves and how expensive to their country? What a contrast, indeed, do we exhibit! What! in such an hour as this, at a moment pregnant with the national fate, when, pressing as the emergency may be, the hard task of squeezing the money from the pockets of an impoverished people, from the toil, the drudgery of the shivering poor, must make the most practised collector's heart ache while he tears it from them. Can it be that people of high rank, and professing high principles, that they or their families should seek to thrive on the spoils of misery, and fatten on the meals wrested from industrious poverty? Can it be that this should be the case with the very persons who state the unprecedented peril of the country as the sole cause of their being found in the ministerial ranks? The Constitution is in danger, religion is in danger, the very existence of the nation itself is endangered; all personal and party considerations ought to vanish, the war must be supported by every possible exertion and by every possible sacrifice; the people must

not murmur at their burdens, it is for their salvation, their all is at stake. The time is come when all honest and disinterested men should rally round the Throne as round a standard—for what? Ye honest and disinterested men, to receive, for your own private emolument, a portion of those very taxes wrung from the people on the pretence of saving them from the poverty and distress which you say the enemy would inflict, but which you take care no enemy shall be able to aggravate. Oh! shame! shame! is this a time for selfish intrigues and the little dirty traffic for lucre and emolument? Does it suit the honor of a gentleman to ask at such a moment? Does it become the honesty of a minister to grant? Is it intended to confirm the pernicious doctrine, so industriously propagated by many, that all public men are imposters, and that every politician has his price? Or even where there is no principle in the bosom, why does not prudence hint to the mercenary and the vain to abstain awhile, at least, and wait the fitting of the times? Improvident impatience! Nay, even from those who seem to have no direct object of office or profit, what is the language which their actions speak? ‘The Throne is in danger! We will support the Throne; but let us share the smiles of Royalty.’ ‘The order of nobility is in danger!’ ‘I will fight for nobility says the Viscount but my zeal would be much greater if I were made an Earl.’ * * * Is there nothing that whispers to that right honorable gentleman that the crisis is too big, that the times are too gigantic to be ruled by the little hackneyed every-day means of ordinary corruption?”

On the subject of Reeve’s libel Mr. Sheridan remarked :

“Never was there any country in which there was so much absence of public principle, and at the same time so many instances of private worth. Never was there so much charity and humanity towards the poor and the distressed; * * * yet amidst these phenomena of private virtue it was to be remarked that there was almost a total want of public spirit, and a most deplorable contempt of public principle. * * * When Rome fell, she fell by the weight of her own vices. * * * But when Great Britain falls, she will fall with a people full of private worth and virtue; she will be ruined by the profligacy of the Government, and the security of her inhabitants, the consequences of those pernicious doctrines which have taught her to place a false confidence in her strength and freedom, and not to look with distrust and apprehension to the misconduct and corruption of those to whom she has trusted the management of her resources.”

Again, in 1795 :

“I am sorry that it is hardly possible for any man to speak in this house, and to obtain credit for speaking from a principle of public spirit; that no man can oppose a minister without being accused of faction, and none, who usually opposed, can support a minister or lend him assistance in anything, without being accused of doing so from interested motives.”

On the assessed tax bill :

“But we have gained, forsooth, several ships by the victory of the first of June,—by the capture of Toulon,—by the acquisition of those charnel houses in the West Indies, in which fifty thousand men have been lost to this country. Consider the price which has been paid for these successes. For these boasted successes, I will say, give me back the blood of Englishmen which has been shed in this fatal contest,—give me back the two hundred and fifty millions of debt which it has occasioned,—give me back the honor of the country which has been tarnished,—give me back the credit of the country, which has been destroyed,—give me back the solidity of the Bank of England, which has been overthrown; the attachment of the people to their ancient constitution, which has been shaken by acts of oppression and tyrannical laws,—give me back the kingdom of Ireland, the connection of which is endangered by a cruel and outrageous system of military coercion,—give me back that pledge of eternal war, which must be attended with inevitable ruin!”

And in June, 1798, the year of the Irish rebellion :

“What! when conciliation was held out to the people, was there any discontent? When the government of Ireland was agreeable to the people, was there any discontent? After the prospect of that conciliation was taken away,—after Lord Fitzwilliam was recalled,—after the hopes which had been raised were blasted,—when the spirit of the people was beaten down, insulted, despised, I will ask any gentleman to point out a single act of conciliation which has emanated from the government of Ireland? On the contrary, has not that country exhibited one continual scene of the most grievous oppression, of the most vexatious proceedings; arbitrary punishments inflicted; torture declared necessary by the highest authority in the sister-kingdom next to that of the legislature? And do gentlemen say that the indignant spirit which is roused by such government is unprovoked? Is this conciliation? Is this lenity? Has everything been done to avert the evils of the rebellion? It is the fashion to say, and the address holds the same language, that the rebellion which now rages in the sister-kingdom has been owing to the machinations of ‘wicked men.’ Agreeing to the amendment proposed, it was my first intention to move that these words should be omitted. But, sir, the fact they assert is true. It is, indeed, to the measures of wicked men that the deplorable state of Ireland is to be imputed. It is to those wicked ministers who have broken the promises they held out, who betrayed the party they seduced into their views, to be the instruments of the foulest treachery that ever was practised against any people. It is to those wicked ministers who have given up that devoted country to plunder,—resigned it a prey to this faction, by which it has so long been trampled upon, and abandoned it to every species of insult and oppression by which a country was ever overwhelmed, or the spirit of a people insulted, that we owe the miseries into which Ireland is plunged, and the dangers by which England is threatened.”

Such, sir, was the burning language of Sheridan, in the British Parliament, on the various questions discussed, and yet who ever heard of any movement—who ever saw the Honorable Speaker descend from his chair and by his talents and influence upon the floor seek either to expel or censure him?

Again, sir, no member here can have forgotten the memorable language of Mr. Corwin, of Ohio, in the Senate of the United States, during the Mexican war. He said:

“Were I a Mexican, as I am an American, I would welcome these invaders with bloody hands to hospitable graves.”

Yet no one ever dreamed of either expelling or censuring Mr. Corwin for this remarkable utterance, based upon sentiments hostile to the war then being waged on the part of our country against Mexico.

Sir, in a free country like ours, is not a latitude of debate to be allowed? Is not discussion to be as broad as it is under a monarchical Government in the Parliament of Great Britain? Sir, there is no subject on which a free people are more sensitive than that of free speech. It is regarded, and justly so, as one of the bulwarks of liberty, and any attempt to abridge it, and especially in these halls, must, as it ought to, be condemned by the American people. And to-day, sir, if this House commits the great blunder of expelling the member from Ohio by the passage of this resolution, mark my prediction, he will rally around him a formidable party, not that the people indorse or sympathize with him in the sentiments contained in his speech, but in vindication of the sacred right of free speech in the Representative Hall of the national Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I rose not only for the purpose of saying to the House that I, for one, could not and would not vote for the resolution of expulsion which has been offered here by the honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to add, that I think he has done the very worst day's work he could possibly have done by introducing a resolution expelling the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Long]; but also for another purpose; and that is to express my dissent from every position taken by the gentleman from Ohio, in that speech. I differ with him “*toto celo*.” He is for giving up the struggle. He is for disunion. He is for the recognition of the southern confederacy, now, at once. It occurs to me, if the view of the gentleman from Ohio was carried out, it would be the saddest day the American people would ever be called upon to witness. Who that has an American heart in his bosom can tolerate for a moment the idea that this great struggle is to be abandoned in ignominy and in disgrace, to the eternal shame of the cause of liberty throughout the world? I do not believe this Government is likely to fail in the struggle. I believe that the people of the loyal States have every assurance and confidence that it will result in our success, and that we will recover authority over every inch of territory belonging to the United States. In opinion I wholly dissent from the gentleman from Ohio, as well as from the gentleman from Maryland.

I believe, sir, that this rebellion will be overcome; not that the southern people will be exterminated or subjugated, but I believe that their military power will be broken; and when it is broken, such is my confidence in their good sense; that they will then return to their allegiance and submit to those liberal terms which, I doubt not, will be proposed. It has often been reiterated that this rebellion is without excuse or justification. This is true to the letter. No people on earth, prior to this civil war, ever enjoyed a higher degree of liberty or a larger amount of happiness than the people of the southern States. And it is right that they should be continually reminded that this rebellion is the offspring of the violent and ungovernable passions of their leading men. In proof of this I desire to quote two extracts from speeches made by Mr. A. H. Stephens, of Georgia, the vice president of the confederate States. In a speech delivered before the Legislature of Georgia on the 14th day of November, 1860, after the election of Mr. Lincoln, he used the following language:

“The first question that presents itself is, shall the people of the South secede from the Union in consequence of the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States? My countrymen, I tell you frankly, candidly, and earnestly, that I do not think that they

ought. In my judgment, the election of no man constitutionally chosen to that high office is sufficient cause for any State to separate from the Union. It ought to stand by and aid still in maintaining the Constitution of the country. To make a point of resistance to the Government, to withdraw from it because a man has been constitutionally elected, puts us in the wrong. We are pledged to maintain the Constitution. Many of us have sworn to support it. Can we, therefore, for the mere election of a man to the Presidency, and that, too, in accordance with the prescribed forms of the Constitution, make a point of resistance to the Government without becoming the breakers of that sacred instrument ourselves, withdraw ourselves from it? Would we not be in the wrong? Whatever fate is to befall this country, let it never be laid to the charge of the people of the South, and especially to the people of Georgia, that we were untrue to our national engagements. Let the fault and the wrong rest upon others. If all our hopes are to be blasted, if the Republic is to go down, let us be bound to the last moment standing on the deck, with the Constitution of the United States waving over our heads. Let the fanatics of the North break the Constitution if such is their fell purpose. Let the responsibility be upon them. I shall speak presently more of their acts; but let not the South, let us not be the ones to commit the aggression. We went into the election with this people. The result was different from what we wished; but the election has been constitutionally held. Were we to make a point of resistance to the Government and go out of the Union on that account, the record would be made up hereafter against us."—*Speech of Alexander H. Stephens before the Legislature of Georgia, delivered November 14, 1860.*

And subsequently, in the secession convention of Georgia, in January, 1861, he spoke as follows:

"This step [of secession] once taken can never be recalled; and all the baleful and withering consequences that must follow will rest on the convention for all coming time. When we and our posterity shall see our lovely South desolated by the demon of war, which this act of yours will inevitably invite and call forth, when our green fields of waving harvests shall be trodden down by the murderous soldiery and fiery car of war sweeping over our land, our temples of justice laid in ashes, all the horrors and desolations of war upon us, who but this convention will be held responsible for it; and who but him who shall have given his vote for this unwise and ill-timed measure, as I honestly think and believe, shall be held to strict account for this suicidal act by the present generation, and probably cursed and execrated by posterity for all coming time, for the wide and desolating ruin that will inevitably follow this act you now propose to perpetrate? Pause, I entreat you." * * *

"What right has the North assailed? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied, and what claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can either of you to day name one governmental act of wrong, deliberately and purposely done by the Government at Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer." * * *

"We have always had the control of the General Government, and can yet if we remain in it and are as united as we have been. We have had a majority of the Presidents chosen from the South, as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had sixty years of southern Presidents to their twenty-four, thus controlling the Executive Department. So of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have had eighteen from the South, and but eleven from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the free States, yet a majority of the court has always been from the South. This we have required, so as to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavorable to us. In like manner we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the legislative branch of Government. In choosing the presiding presidents (*pro tempore*) of the Senate, we have had twenty-four to their eleven. Speakers of the House, we have had twenty-three and they twelve. While the majority of the Representatives, from their greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, to a great extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country." * * *

"Attorney generals we have had fourteen, while the North have had but five; Foreign ministers we have had eighty-six, and they but fifty-four." * * *

"We have had the principal embassies, so as to secure the world markets for our cotton, tobacco, and sugar, on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher offices of both army and navy, while a large proportion of the soldiers and sailors were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors, and comptrollers, filling the Executive Departments. The records show for the last fifty years that of three thousand thus employed we have had more than two-thirds of the same, while we have but one-third of the white population of the Republic." * * *

"A fraction over three-fourths of the revenue collected for the support of the Government has uniformly been raised from the North. Pause now while you can, gentlemen, and contemplate carefully and candidly these important items." * * *

"For you to attempt to overthrow such a Government as this, under which we have lived for more than three quarters of a century, in which we have gained our wealth, our standing as a nation, our domestic safety while the elements of peril are around us, with peace and tranquillity accompanied with unbounded prosperity, and rights unassailed, is the height of madness, folly, and wickedness, to which I can neither lend my sanction nor my voice."

Now, sir, if the question were put to me, would I abandon this struggle? I would answer in the language of the great Kentucky orator, "Never, never, never!" If again asked "When shall we abandon the struggle; at what particular time?" I would answer, "When the last dollar is expended, and the last man raised for the prosecution of the war, for putting down this causeless, this infamous, and unjustifiable rebellion. Not until the credit of the Union is lost

and in irretrievable ruin, would I give up the struggle to maintain the supremacy of the law and the authority of the Constitution over our entire soil.

Not until the germ of patriotism has withered and rotted in the national heart would I yield up the struggle. Not until the last vestige of respect was lost for that proud and beautiful banner, the emblem of liberty and of law, which decorates your chair. Not, sir, until the thrilling memories which cluster around the actions of those immortal men (Washington and Lafayette,) whose images adorn these walls, shall have entirely died away in our hearts. Not until the last pulsation of patriotism shall have ceased to beat in the American heart would I yield the struggle in which our people are at present engaged for the national existence, and that of free institutions. I am for the Union *first, last, and all the time*. Whatever stands in the way of the Union I say let it perish.

My friend from Ohio, if he will allow me to designate him as such, seems to me in getting out of the war by recognizing the southern confederacy, will only plunge the country into a war that will continue as long as the endless ages of time shall run their ceaseless course. For the sake of *peace* the gentleman from Ohio would dissolve the Union and stop the war! Sir, I answer him, that for the sake of *permanent* peace on this continent, I would preserve the Union, and in order to preserve it, I would continue the war. By wisdom, prudence and conciliation, these terrible calamities might and ought to have been averted. But whatever might have been accomplished before the war, it seems to me, sir, now, that there is but one way to terminate the struggle consistent with the idea of national unity, and that is by effectually overcoming and putting down all who stand opposed to the maintenance of the authority of the Government of the United States. It is idle to talk about the Government having no constitutional power to coerce sovereign and independent States. The Constitution provides that the President shall see that "the laws are faithfully executed;" and how can these laws be executed, when either people or States stand in the way of their execution, without applying the necessary force to put and keep them in operation?

Talk about coercing States! Sir, what would a Government be worth which had not the authority and energy to preserve its own existence? Suppose the Union was dissolved to-morrow, and the State of Ohio determined to secede from the northern Government, what would the gentleman say? Would he say let her go in peace, and upon the ground that her people were not bound under the Constitution to submit to the national authority? Sir, where would this doctrine terminate? Suppose, sir, every other State determined to secede, and set up an independent government for itself? If the rule is to be tolerated in one case it must govern in all. Why not? And is the gentleman from Ohio prepared to see as many different and independent governments set up on this continent as there are now, or may hereafter be, States in the Union? Under the prevalence of such a doctrine I would ask him what is to become of the national debt? Who is to pay it? What is to become of the Army and of the Navy? Who is to defend the seaboard? Who is to protect our commerce upon the seas? Who is to own the Territories? Who is to represent the American name abroad? Who is to defend us against foreign aggression? The very suggestion of these questions shows the absurdity of the position assumed by the gentleman from Ohio in his speech, and a hundred other questions of a similar character, would overwhelm and confound him and all others who think like him. No, sir, there can be no two separate Governments on this continent. We are bound to live under the same Constitution; this is our only safety, and those people who will not do so peaceably must be made to do so forcibly.

In regard to coercion I might add that all Governments, whether democratic or monarchical, are but different systems of coercion. No Government could stand a day without the principle of coercion. Without it, not only Governments would be broken up, but society itself would be dissolved. In one of his great speeches in the Senate of the United States, Henry Clay used the following language:

"If any one State, or any portion of the people of any State, choose to place themselves in array against the Government of the Union, *I am for trying the strength of this Gov-*

ernment. I am for ascertaining whether we have a Government or not, practicable, efficient, capable of maintaining its authority, and upholding the powers and interests which belong to a Government. Nor, sir, am I to be alarmed or dissuaded from any such course by intimations of the spilling of blood. If blood is to be spilt, by whose fault is it to be spilt? Upon the supposition I maintained, it will be the fault of those who choose to raise the standard of disunion, and endeavor to prostrate the Government. And, sir, when that is done, so long as it pleases God to give me a voice to express my sentiments, or an arm, weak and enfeebled as it may be by age, that voice and that arm will be on the side of my country, for the support of the general authority, and for the maintenance of the powers of the Union " * * * *

"If Kentucky to-morrow unfurls the banner of resistance, I never will fight under that banner; I owe a paramount allegiance to the whole Union—a subordinate one to my own State."—*Henry Clay, in the Senate, 1850.*

But, sir, admitting for the sake of the argument that there could be two independent Governments established here, each composed of different States, and based upon the right of secession, I might well ask the gentleman from Ohio, how long would they last? And to-day, sir, he talks seriously about a dissolution of the American Union! If the thing were possible, how would he go about it? What would be the first step? Would he withdraw the splendid Army under the command of the brave and invincible Grant to the north side of the Potomac? And what a spectacle would that be for the American people to look upon at this stage of our momentous struggle! What next? A line of separation is to be established. Where? Where is the boundary to run, if we recognize the southern confederacy? Can the gentleman from Ohio answer the question? Let it be remembered that these insurgents claim all the southern States. Let it not be forgotten that all the southern States, with the exception I believe of Maryland and Delaware, are represented in the Richmond Congress. Who is to take Washington city? Is yonder monument, commemorative of the virtues and the great actions of him who was "first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," over looking with calm and god-like brow the ceaseless flow of that beautiful river, whose waves may kiss every strand, and from whose shores that empyrean banner may be borne to greet the eye and reinvigorate the soul of Liberty's martyrs in every land, is it to stand upon the soil of a government established upon the ruins of the great Republic? And is that sacred spot, Mount Vernon, with all the glorious associations that cluster around it, its precious relics, the sacred ashes that lie beneath its soil, the old mansion, with its beautiful walks, its stately trees, its evergreens and its fragrant flowers, planted by the hand of Washington, to belong to a hostile people? Is the home of the Father of his Country to be denationalized and American citizens no longer permitted to kneel at his tomb? God forbid! Who is to occupy this splendid and magnificent Capitol? Where is Missouri to go, that young and giant Commonwealth that I have the honor, in part, of representing on this floor? What is to become of her Union people, who have sacrificed so much in the cause of their country? If recognition takes place, is her broad domain, an empire within itself equal to all New England, and perhaps with natural wealth superior to any other State in the Union; is it to be made the tail end of the southern confederacy, whose chief political doctrine is the right of secession, and whose main corner-stone, in the language of Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, is "African slavery?" And where is Kentucky, the resting-place of Clay and of Crittenden, to go? Will the gentleman from Ohio consent to the flourishing city, that he and his distinguished colleague represents on this floor, being located upon the immediate border of a foreign and hostile country, separated only by a narrow river? Upon the theory of recognition, what is to become of "Old Virginia," that "*magna mater virum*?" Who is to decide? The people of Virginia? Sir, will her loyal inhabitants, and the loyal people of Maryland, and of the other loyal States ever consent that these two great States shall be lost to the American Union? Does not the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Long], see that the first step at negotiation would be a failure? That it is "war to the knife and the knife to the hilt," except upon the condition of the national integrity and unity? Does he not see that, the withdrawal of our troops would only be a withdrawal for the purpose of renewing the struggle at once and afresh, until one or the other of these Powers is overcome? I say to the gentleman from Ohio that the Southern Confederacy will be established, all

over this land, and this Government go down, or this Government must assert its authority, maintain its jurisdiction, and crush the rebellion. The two cannot exist side by side, and entertaining this view, I am on the side of the Government. In the language of the immortal Clay, my paramount obligation is to the present Government, and not to the State in which I was born or in which I live.

What does the gentleman propose by recognition? What? I ask him where he would run the line? I have seen no man who could answer that question. The very suggestion of a line brings along with it the idea of continuous war. What is to become of the Territories? Who is to take them; the people of the loyal States, or the people of the pretended confederacy? The controversy itself started originally mainly about the Territories, and who is to take them in the event of recognition? Look at the sea-coast, reaching from the Chesapeake around to the mouth of the Rio Grande, three thousand miles, with all its bays and harbors, and nearly all of them in the possession of the Government of the United States. Shall we surrender these? And what about the commerce of the great rivers of the West, and especially of that great inland sea, the Mississippi? Who is to command and control the commerce, which floats upon its broad bosom, to the Gulf and hence to the sea? Are we to give that up? And yet that follows recognition! Do gentlemen expect to obtain peace by dissolution? Vain delusion! Look back at the teachings and warnings of the fathers of the Republic in regard to this mighty question. Let the gentleman from Ohio drink into his heart the inspirations of Washington when the foundations of free government were laid upon this continent. Let him study well the opinions of Clay, Webster and Jackson, and the great men whose hearts were often overwhelmed with anxiety in the midst of the great political contests which took place in this Capitol, in reference to the fate of the American Union. * They had no desire to lift the veil and look beyond the destruction of the Government. To their inspired vision the cause of liberty and of progress was identified with the continuance and perpetuity of the Union formed by our fathers. There was no hope beyond this. Without it, to them all was uncertainty, doubt, darkness and despotism. In that grand peroration of the noblest effort of his life, and which will be read with admiration as long as the English language is spoken among men, Mr. Webster said:

"I have not allowed myself, sir, to look beyond the Union, to see what lies hidden in the dark recess behind. I have not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty when the bonds that unite us together shall be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of disunion, to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below; nor could I regard him as a safe counselor in the affairs of this Government whose thoughts should be mainly bent on considering, not how the Union may be best preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the people when it should be broken up and destroyed. While the Union lasts, we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant that in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise! God grant that on my vision never may be opened what lies behind! When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance rather behold the gorgeous ensign of the Republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as 'What is all this worth?' nor those other words of delusion and folly, 'Liberty first and Union afterwards,' but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea and over the land, and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—'Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!'"

The one is inseparably connected with the other. The cause of civilization and of human liberty must hang together with this Government, in my humble opinion. We owe it to ourselves in gratitude to a noble ancestry, we owe it to the posterity which is to succeed us that this bright casket of liberty shall be transmitted to them unimpaired. This free Constitution of ours was framed after a long and bloody struggle by our patriot ancestors. We had grown up and prospered under it, and had become, up to the breaking out of this rebellion, one of the proudest and most powerful nations on the face of the earth. And damned, to everlasting perdition, be the degenerate sons of noble

sires who would permit such a bright and lovely heritage to pass from them. [Applause in the galleries.]

But, sir, it is not alone, for ourselves and for our posterity upon this continent that we should maintain this struggle. Where, sir, is the hope of the world? Follow the course of the sun in its annual circuit around the heavens; go to the benighted portions of the globe; go to the civilized and Christian parts of earth, where the people are down-trodden by strong and arbitrary Governments, and where do they look for a model of imitation and for help and succor in the days of their trial? Where, but to our own hitherto happy country, the United States of America; ay, sir, the UNITED STATES! This has been to them the beacon light, the "bright particular star," which, like the star in the East that appeared over the babe of Bethlehem, is guiding the oppressed of all the earth to the safe and secure resting-place of liberty.

Sir, we owe not only to ourselves and to our posterity, but we owe to all future humanity in every country, beneath every clime, the maintainance of this struggle, against traitors armed for the purpose of destroying the Government, until we can come out of it with the stars and stripes once more floating proudly not only from the dome of this Capitol; but from every hill-top and valley from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Penobscot to the Rio Grande; over the deck of every ship whose Columbiads awake the morning with their salute to Freedom's sentinel and warning to Tyrants, on every wave that reflects back to the sky's blue vault its sister stars; not more glorious, in their heavenly sphere, than those that will then float over the brave men, fair women and merry children, North and South, of our again united and happy country. [Applause from the galleries.]

I am, then, sir, for war, in order that when peace does come it may be permanent and lasting. Better fight to preserve our national unity than go to pieces and have thereafter a thousand multiplied causes of war among ourselves. The unity of the nation once settled, the Constitution and laws vindicated and obeyed, there will be no longer any cause for strife and contention among ourselves and our posterity. We shall not fall a prey to the great Powers of the earth, but feeling that consciousness of strength which unity always inspires, practiced in the art of war as our people will be, and chastened and subdued by the terrible ordeal through which we will have passed, our Government and our people will then be able to stand the test of time and defy the world in arms against us.

Nor let it be said that there can be no Union after the end of this cruel and unnatural civil war. Nations, like individuals, are at last governed by their own best interests, and the war once terminated there will be a thousand considerations of mutual interest to bind us indissolubly together. The same motives which prompted our fathers to establish a common Government and Union, will operate with tenfold power on us in restoring that which we had well-nigh lost. The feelings of prejudice and of hate cannot always last; these will wear away with time, and both parties, having learned the prowess and strength of each other, will in the future cultivate, in a higher degree, those sentiments of mutual respect and forbearance which are so essential to the peace of the country and of the good order of society.

Such, sir, is the history of the world. Every body for peace, and yet men engaged in perpetual war. Other nations have had similar trials to those which are now unhappily upon us. They have been rent and torn by civil wars. But at last the powerful motive of self-interest has controlled, and people, apparently forever alienated, have united and lived happily together. The States of ancient Greece after many civil wars hesitated not in uniting to drive back the Persian invader. The border wars between England and Scotland, lasting for centuries, were finally settled in peace, and claymore and cross-bow lived in harmony and union under one and the same monarch. The bloodiest record of English history is that of the fierce struggle between the houses of York and Lancaster, yet those wars at last terminated, and the white and red roses were happily united.

“The rivalship of white and red,
Of Rose and Rose was ended;
They say, when fierce contentions fled,
On beauty's cheek they blended.”

Similar illustrations may be found running through the history of all our race, among the Jews, Romans, Spaniards, the Germans, and nearly all carrying along with them the encouraging idea that civil wars are not necessarily fatal to the peace of those who are engaged in them, nor to union and harmony when the unhappy conflicts have ended.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the disconnected nature of the remarks which I am addressing to the House on this occasion, and I will detain it but a few moments longer. How shall the Union be restored when we have broken the military power of the confederate States? We hear a great deal about extermination. The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. SMITH,] has spoken of “subjugation, emancipation, extermination.” These “harps of a thousand strings” have been played upon pretty extensively here. We have heard, too, of confiscation not only of the property of the rebels, but of that of their children, and of that other doctrine of “miscegenation.” [Laughter.] I believe that is what they call it.

Mr. Speaker, I have entire confidence not only in the patriotism, but also in the liberality and the wise statesmanship of the people of the loyal States of this Union; and in making this remark I apply it to all parties. I believe that when the military power of the rebel States is broken, the most liberal terms will be offered to the southern people consistent with our duty to the Government whose authority and integrity we are defending, and consistent with those just responsibilities and burdens which must fall and rest upon those wicked men who have been instrumental in inaugurating and carrying on this most causeless and unholy rebellion. I have never believed that this war would result in the extermination, degradation or exile of the masses of the people of the South, or the robbery of their property; nor have I ever believed that it would result in universal emancipation, without providing ample and liberal compensation to owners of slaves, as property, and in giving them full time to dispose of an institution long established among them, and the sudden annihilation of which might lead to the most disastrous consequences both to the white and to the black race. I speak of the masses who have been misled; for I believe that all parties agree that the leaders in this strife, the men who inaugurated this rebellion, should be brought to condemnation and punishment, either in meeting out to them the full penalty of the law, or by perpetual banishment.

But, sir, the work that we have first to do is to break and destroy their military power. Until this is accomplished it is idle to talk about restoration. This is the first thing to be done, and there ought not to be two opinions upon that question between any two loyal men, no matter what party they belong to. Were it not for a disposition on the part of individuals to promote the interest of this or that party, of this or that candidate to the presidential office, there is no good reason why eight-tenths of the members of this House should not agree upon a liberal, enlightened, statesmanlike, and constitutional policy for the purpose of overthrowing this rebellion and reestablishing the authority of the Government.

There may be some peace men on this side of the House, like the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. LONG], who has so avowed himself, or like the gentleman from New York, [Mr. FERNANDO WOOD.] There may be some men (I cannot designate them myself) who are *per se*, disunionists, and have been these many years; because we know that there are such in the North as well as in the South; and we know that there are some men who claim now to be, *par excellence*, the Union men of the country, who doubt the loyalty and patriotism of every man who happens to differ from them; and yet but a few years ago they were “singing psalms” to disunion. But a few years ago they were praying for disunion, simply because there happened to exist in the country an institution that was obnoxious to their sensibilities, and their opinion of right. Sir, I have no confidence in the unionism of such men; and when I see them sneaking around this Capitol, with the blood of this rebellion reeking upon their

garments and dripping from their skirts, I cannot repress that indignation which every true patriot ought to feel against all those who have been in any way instrumental at any time in inciting, promoting, or in any way encouraging it.

Sir, I refer to the radical abolitionists of the John Brown and Wendell Phillips school, who have never manifested any respect for the laws, nor any love for constitution under which they have been nurtured and which has protected them, even in their *free speech*, and while they, like the fabled adder, have turned upon and endeavored to destroy both with their envenomed tongues, and I take this occasion to say, that the country has almost as much to fear from the example and teachings of these radicals as from the rebels who are in arms almost within sight of this Capitol. Sir, we have traitors in the North as well as in the South. But I thank God I have believed and still believe that they are few in number outside of the rebellion. The Republican party proper I have looked upon as an anti-slavery party in the just sense of the term, and according to those principles which were avowed by such men as Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, and other fathers of the Republic when they laid the foundations of free government on this continent. They were anti-slavery then; they regarded the institution of slavery as a great evil, and under the Constitution and according to the forms of law they looked to and desired its gradual extinction in this country. But they were willing to leave this question to the patience, the sound judgment, and the patriotism of their posterity; and but for those pestiferous men, the radical abolitionists of the North and the secessionists of the South, so long working in coöperation, and aiming at the same object, our unhappy country might have been saved this bloody ordeal, endangering the very existence of the Government, causing so many tears to flow and so many hearts to bleed in every nook and corner of the country.

But the great middle class, of which we are the Representatives, the middle men of all parties, Republican and Democratic, in the loyal States, aye, and in the disloyal States too, are true to the core. They rise to the dignity of the subject. They can and do appreciate the importance of the restoration and salvation of the Government. All that they desire is—a more broad and liberal statesmanship in the leaders of their respective parties—for them to unite, to come together, and pull up by the roots this accursed rebellion, and restore peace to the land.

Mr. Speaker, I have a document which I believe I will read before taking my seat. It is from the pen of the present Chief Magistrate of the nation. I know he is not regarded as very good authority with some of my friends around me, and I cannot say that he is the best authority with me on all questions. But I think this is one of the soundest papers that he has written since he came into power. I thought so at the time I first read it. I think so yet. And I do not see why every loyal man may not come up to this standard. It is a letter addressed to Horace Greeley some eighteen months ago. I know that matters have considerably advanced since this letter was written. Though not being a very progressive man, still I have kept advancing “step by step to the music of the Union,” and I have at all events, I believe, got up to this letter. I will read it for the benefit of my Democratic friends, who seem to be listening to me with such patient attention:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, August 22, 1862.

DEAR SIR: I have just read yours of the 19th, addressed to myself through the New York Tribune. If there be any statements or assumptions of fact which I may know to be erroneous, I do not now and here controvert them. If there be in it any inferences which I may believe to be falsely drawn, I do not now and here argue against them. If there be perceptible in it an impatient and dictatorial tone, I waive it in deference to an old friend whose heart I have always supposed to be right.

As to the policy I “seem to be pursuing,” as you say, I have not meant to leave any one in doubt. I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored the nearer the Union will be “the Union as it was.” If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time *save* slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time *destroy* slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle *is* to save the Union, and is *not* either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing *any* slave I would do it;

and if I could save it by freeing *all* slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save this Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do *not* believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do *less* whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do *more* whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors; and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have here stated my purpose according to my view of *official* duty; and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed *personal* wish that all men everywhere could be free.

Yours,

A. LINCOLN.

HON. HORACE GREELEY.

I believe I might put that to the vote of my honorable friends around me, and that, with the exception of the honorable gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. HARRIS,] and perhaps the honorable gentleman from Ohio, whose case we have under consideration, it would get a universal "ay." I do not think that my friends on the Republican side will back down from so broad and liberal a policy as is indicated in that letter.

Mr. Speaker, yet another word. I have referred to the immense interests at stake in the struggle that is now going on between this Government and those who are in rebellion against it. Defeat to us is eternal, everlasting disgrace, and dishonor to ourselves and our children. We must succeed. It cannot be otherwise.

In the mighty struggle which we suppose is now impending, when a more terrible crash of arms will be felt than any that has yet taken place during this terrible strife, suppose that accomplished General, the most accomplished, perhaps, of all the generals on either side, at least equal to any in military skill and power, Robert E. Lee, should beat down our forces and drive them back across the Potomac; what then? Are our hearts to sink within us, are we to give up the struggle in despair? Suppose this Capital is taken, suppose the President, at the other end of the avenue, is compelled to remove a few hundred miles further North, and this Congress to go elsewhere for the purpose of holding its sessions. Suppose the Potomac is crossed, the Chesapeake reached? Baltimore taken? Suppose they march to the Susquehanna, and pass victorious through Maryland and Pennsylvania, will you then be contented to give up the struggle? Never, never! Stand by your flag! Stand by your Constitution! Rally the power and strength of the loyal States that have not yet exhibited themselves. Bring out your middle classes; bring out your gray-headed and gray bearded men, and put the Union at last upon its *real* trial.

Will it take a year longer; two years longer; five years longer? What are years in the history of a nation; what is time; what is money; what is blood; compared to the preservation and salvation of a Government like this? Will you say, that we have already lost \$2,000,000,000; that five hundred thousand men are already missing from the nation's muster roll, and that you are therefore ready to acknowledge the effort to save the Union a failure? Sir, here are five hundred thousand more of our sons to be sacrificed, and here is a Government to be saved. Which is of most value, \$2,000,000,000 and five hundred thousand men for putting down this rebellion, or this Government? Will you weigh these sacrifices against the preservation of liberty and free institutions, for ourselves, our posterity, and all who shall make America their happy home? God forbid! God forbid! We will *not* give it up, let the war last five years or ten years. We will continue it as long as any power remains in this Government. And if I could send the same spirit to those beautiful children whom God has blessed me with, it should descend to them from sire to son, until that flag which is now streaming from the dome of this Capitol should wave over every portion of this once happy country, as the flag of a free, powerful, happy, and redeemed people.

Sir, if we do not bring ourselves out of these troubles, if we are so degenerate as to permit a Government like this to die; if we are such unworthy sons of noble sires as to shrink from and give up this contest, we deserve all the curses that will fall upon us. Let us fight on, trusting in that Providence which sustained our ancestors. We are in His hands, and if we are sufficiently worthy of the trust that has been placed in us not to basely surrender it up, God will see to it, that this nation was not born to die so soon.

Look at the bright destiny that awaits this country if we can get over the

dark and stormy sea that lies before us. Look at the West, at the Father, of-Waters, upon which it is my good fortune to live, and see the larger, brighter and richer heritage than that which lies east of that mighty stream that is yet in store for it. Even during the present session of Congress we are preparing to admit three new States, which the enterprise and energy of our sons have already rendered populous, extending to the base of the Rocky mountains. In Nevada, Colorado, and in California, are to be developed untold riches, that of themselves will be the means of relieving us from the burdens which will have been brought upon us in consequence of this cruel and unnatural war. Let us come out of it, and let the angel of peace once more spread his bright wings over the continent, over a free and united people, and the energy of our masses will be revived. Like a young giant they will spring up at a bound; their activity renewed, their hopes inspired, their prospects brightened, they will go forward in the enjoyment of peace, of free institutions, and with a success altogether unknown in our previous history.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ROLLINS, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask but a minute or two more.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. There is no objection, on this side of the House, to the gentleman having the additional time he asks.

Mr. ROLLINS, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House at this late hour. That, sir, is the bright day to which I look. That is the view to which my vision turns. I want to see this disastrous war brought to an honorable close, and these difficulties adjusted, free from prejudice, and by a liberal, enlightened, wise, and philanthropic policy that will enable the people of all the States to meet once more in council upon terms of fraternity and equality, and consult, dispassionately and sensibly, in regard to their own true interests and those of their posterity. Burying the sad memories of the last few years, being purified by the misfortunes and calamities which unhappily have overtaken us, and relying with unshaken confidence upon that good Providence who watched over the great Republic in its infancy, it cannot be but that a bright destiny still awaits the American people. Our American nationality preserved, with a name known and honored as heretofore throughout all earth, our Government will be at once the envy and admiration of mankind. Beneath the broad ægis of a free Constitution and equal laws, with the States and the General Government working in harmony under the influence of well-adjusted and appropriately balanced powers, our country will be the home and the asylum of all who seek to cast their lot where men are protected in all their rights, where the avenues to honor, to fame, and to usefulness, are open to the humblest citizen, having energy, virtue, and talent to recommend him.

Let our watchword be "upward and onward," and even during the present generation we shall behold our Government the first among the nations of the earth. Wearing the proud title of American citizen, the rights of the humblest man will be respected in every part of the habitable globe. And looking to our hitherto unparalleled advancement in all the elements of national power, in population, in wealth, in the intelligence of the masses, in mechanical skill, in agricultural industry, the day cannot be far distant when that bright and beautiful banner, the emblem of western civilization, will have gathered upon its ample folds an hundred stars, representing the independent States stretching across this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific seas, wearing the proud motto, "*E pluribus unum*," and resting secure within an American Union which shall give to all a consciousness of strength sufficient to strangle treason at home, and repel invasion from abroad, thus reassuring the world that at last the United States of America is

"The land of the free and the home of the brave."

[Applause in the galleries.]

11. 2007.084